

May 8, 2002

(G/SAB/Agendas//2002 Agendas/USTRCRAAG052002.wpd)

**PROPOSED AGENDA**  
**UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANKS (UST) CLEANUP AND RESOURCE**  
**CONSERVATION AND RECOVERY ACT (RCRA) SUBTITLE C PROGRAM**  
**BENEFITS, COSTS AND IMPACTS REVIEW PANEL**  
**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**  
**SCIENCE ADVISORY BOARD**  
**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY HEADQUARTERS**  
**1201 Constitution Avenue, NW**  
**Washington, D.C. 20004**  
**EPA East Room 1117**

**Monday, May 20, 2002:**

**NOTE:** Prior to or at the start of the meeting, UST/RCRA BCI Review Panel Members & Consultants (M/C) should have prepared pre-meeting written comments on the charge questions to forward to the Chair and DFO. Providing comments on diskette in Word Perfect 9 or earlier, Rich Text File, or in ASCII format would be ideal. The plan is to circulate the pre-meeting comments among the Panel.

**I. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS AND WELCOME:**

9:00 a.m. - 9:30 a.m.

- a. Welcome and Introduction of UST/RCRA BCI Review Panel Members(M), Consultants(C) and Guests Dr. A. Myrick ("Rick") Freeman, Chair, UST/RCRA BCI Panel
- b. Introduction of Participants and Disclosure of Members and Consultants Interest in Topic and Conflict-of-Interest Procedures SAB & Participants
- c. Introduction to SAB Procedures and Logistics of Review Dr. K. Jack Kooyoomjian, SAB Staff
- d. Administrative Items (Services in the area, getting around the Federal Triangle Complex, Security, etc.)

**II. WELCOME AND BACKGROUND ON PROJECT:**

9:30 a.m. - 9:40 a.m.

Mr. Michael H. Shapiro,  
DAA/OSWER

**III. INTRODUCTION TO THE SPEAKERS  
AND OVERVIEW OF THE UST/RCRA BCI DOCUMENTS:**

Mr. David Nicholas,  
OSWER Staff

9:40 a.m. - 9:50 a.m.

- a. Overview and Charge
- b. Introduction to the Presenters

**IV. UST/RCRA BCI PRESENTATIONS:**

9:50 a.m. - 12:00 noon

- a. Presentations: Emphasis on Methodology Issues and Special Points of Interest, Including a Brief Description of Requirements of RCRA Title C, and the 1998 Corrective Action RIA for RCRA Subtitle C and UST

Mr. David Nicholas  
& Staff TBA

**BREAK** 10:30 - 11:00 a.m.

**IV. UST/RCRA BCI PRESENTATIONS: CONTINUED:**

b. Presentations: Continued  
11:00 a.m. - 12:00 noon.

OSWER Staff (TBA)

**LUNCH** 12:00 noon -1:15 p.m.

**IV. UST/RCRA BCI PRESENTATIONS: CONTINUED:**

c. Questions & Answers  
1:15 p.m. - 2:30 p.m.

UST/RCRA BCI Review Panel M/C

**V. PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

2:30 p.m. - 3:15 p.m.

Interested Public

**BREAK** 3:15p.m. - 3:45 p.m.

**VI. DISCUSS CHARGE QUESTION #1:**

3:45 p.m. - 4:15 p.m.

Dr. Rick Freeman, Chair, and  
UST./RCRA BCI Panel & M/C

**VII. DISCUSS CHARGE QUESTION #2 & #3:  
SCENARIOS; BENEFITS: HEALTH:**

4:15 p.m. - 5:30 p.m.

Dr. Rick Freeman, Chair, and  
UST./RCRA BCI Panel & M/C

**ADJOURN FOR THE DAY:** 5:30 p.m.

**DINNER WITH SAB AND UST/RCRA BCI REVIEW PANEL AND GUESTS - 6:45 p.m.**  
(Optional)

**Tuesday, May 21, 2002:**

**VIII. RECONVENE UST/RCRA BCI REVIEW PANEL:**

(Planning the Day's Activities)

8:30 a.m. - 8:35 a.m.

a. Expectations for Today's Activities

Dr. Rick Freeman, Chair  
and UST/RCRA BCI Panel M/C

**IX. DISCUSS CHARGE QUESTION #2 & #3: BENEFITS:  
ECOSYSTEMS, OTHER, PROPERTY VALUES:**

8:35 a.m. - 9:00 a.m.

UST/RCRA BCI Panel M/C

**X. DISCUSS CHARGE QUESTIONS #2 & #3: COSTS,  
DISTRIBUTIONAL IMPACTS, PROGRAM CONTEXT  
ATTRIBUTES:**

UST/RCRA BCI Panel M/C

9:00 a.m. - 10:00 a.m.

**XI. DISCUSS CHARGE QUESTION #4:  
ALTERNATIVE METHODS:**

UST/RCRA BCI Panel M/C

10:00 a.m. - 10:30 a.m.

**BREAK 10:30 a.m. - 11:00 a.m.**

**XII. DISCUSS WRITING ASSIGNMENTS:**

UST/RCRA BCI Panel M/C

11:00 a.m. - 11:15 a.m.

a. Discussion of Charge Questions and Panel M/C Preferences for Writing Assignments

**XIII. BREAK-OUT SESSION FOR WRITING:**

UST/RCRA BCI Panel M/C

11:15 a.m. - 12:15 p.m.

a. Review and Revision of Pre-Meeting Draft Materials.; Write New Materials

**LUNCH 12:15 p.m. - 1:30 p.m.**

**XIV. DEBRIEFING OF AGENCY OSWER STAFF**

Dr. Rick Freeman, Chair

1:30 p.m. - 2:30 p.m.

UST/RCRA BCI Panel

a. Round-the-Table Points

UST/RCRA BCI Panel M/C

b. Open Discussion

& Participants

**XV. NEXT STEPS: SCHEDULE FOR COMPLETING  
WRITING ASSIGNMENTS, REVIEW DRAFT  
LETTER, TELECONFERENCE JUNE 18<sup>TH</sup>, AND  
OTHER STEPS FOR CLOSURE:**

Dr. Rick Freeman, Chair

2:30 p.m. - 2:55 p.m.

UST/RCRA BCI Panel

& Participants

c. Next Steps and Plan for Closure on Topic

Dr. Rick Freeman, Chair

Contingency Conference Call June 18, 2002

and UST/RCRA M/C

d. Selecting Next Meeting(s) Dates as Appropriate, if Needed

**XVI. CLOSING COMMENTS:**

Dr. Rick Freeman, Chair,

2:55 p.m. - 3:00 p.m.

UST/RCRA BCI Review Panel

**ADJOURN 3:00 p.m.**

**NOTE:**

*The UST/RCRA BCI Review Panel M/C should be prepared to embellish/re-write pre-meeting written comments during the meeting and discuss the issues as a group during the meeting.*

**The Proposed Charge:** The Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response (OSWER) is requesting that the EPA Science Advisory Board (SAB) review the following documents: “*Approaches to Assessing the Benefits, Costs, and Impacts of the RCRA Subtitle C Program*” and “*Approaches to Assessing the Benefits, Costs, and Impacts of the Office of Underground Storage Tanks Cleanup Program*.” The draft Charge to the SAB is:

- I. *Does the “OSWER Attributes Matrix” (Exhibit 1-1 in both reports) provide a good list of program attributes that could appropriately be used to describe OSWER program benefits, costs, impacts, and other key factors influencing program performance? Does the list provide a reasonable starting point for an analysis of an OSWER program that would ensure consideration of a broad range of program impacts and features? Should any attributes be modified, or deleted or added to this list, and if so, why?*
- II. *Keeping in mind that it was OSWER’s intention to evaluate a range of methodological options, and to include some relatively less resource-intensive options (recognizing these are likely to be less technically rigorous), are the methods presented viable and technically sound? Will the methods lead to defensible conclusions? Are the assumptions associated with the methods reasonable? If you believe any of these methods or assumptions are not viable, sound, or defensible, why not? Are the methods consistent with EPA’s Guidelines for Economic Analyses, to the extent the guidelines address the OSWER program attributes?*
- III. *Are the methods clearly and adequately described, for purposes of making a decision to select preferred methods for additional development and implementation? Are the advantages, disadvantages, and data requirements associated with each option clearly and adequately described? Is additional information needed for any of these methods in order for OSWER management to make an informed decision? If so, what information?*
- IV. *Are there alternative methods (or modifications of methods presented in the reports) that could be used to better characterize any of the attributes addressed in the two reports, keeping potential resource limitations in mind? If so, why? We are particularly interested in seeking SAB advice on methodologies to characterize the more traditional human health/environmental benefits (which represent EPA’s core areas of responsibility), but OSWER would also welcome any recommendations the SAB might have on better ways to characterize and/or quantify some of the more “non-traditional” attributes. These include sustainability and other long-term program impacts; the value of regulatory requirements that focus on providing information to the public; and the influence on program performance of factors such as stakeholder concerns and statutory/legal constraints.*

The charge listed above can also be found on the Science Advisory Board website at: <http://www.epa.gov/sab/ustrcrapanel.htm>